

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 EDMUND OKOLIE,

10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 CITY OF SEATTLE, THE SEATTLE POLICE
13 DEPARTMENT, LINDSAY BROWN, DAVID
14 BAUER, MICHAEL SILVAGNI, JAMES
15 BALAWA, AND ROGER RUSNESS

16 Defendant.

No. C17-1531 RSM

**ORDER GRANTING CITY OF
SEATTLE’S MOTION FOR ORDER RE:
PLAINTIFF’S CASE OBLIGATIONS
AND ENFORCING PRIOR ORDERS,
AND RESPONSE TO JANUARY 12
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

17 THIS MATTER, having come before the Court on Defendant, City of Seattle’s (hereinafter
18 “City”) Motion for Order re: Plaintiff’s Case Obligations and Enforcing Prior Orders, and Response
19 to January 12 Order to Show Cause, and the Court having read and considered the records and files
20 herein, and the Court being fully advised in the premises, it is HEREBY ORDERED:

- 21 1) No later than March 2, 2018, Plaintiff and counsel for the City shall meet in person at a
22 time and place that the parties mutually agree on. They shall conduct the conference that
23

1 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) requires. Plaintiff may bring a person to serve as an interpreter, but
2 the City is not obligated to provide an interpreter for Plaintiff.

- 3 2) Within one week of that meeting, counsel for the City shall mail Plaintiff a draft of a joint
4 status report. Within one week of receiving that report, Plaintiff shall telephone counsel
5 for the City to inform the City of any requested changes. The City shall file the report no
6 later than March 21, 2018.
- 7 3) Within 14 days of the filing of the joint status report, Plaintiff shall provide the
8 interrogatory responses and responses to requests for production that are detailed in the
9 Honorable Richard A. Jones's November 22, 2016 order in Plaintiff's previous suit (No.
10 15-1258RAJ).
- 11 4) The Court and the City (and any Defendant Plaintiff later joins in this action) are entitled
12 to presume that Plaintiff received any document mailed to him at his address of record
13 within three days of its mailing. Plaintiff is responsible for updating the Court and the
14 City regarding any changes in address.
- 15 5) In accordance with Judge Jones's January 24, 2017 order, all orders entered by the Court
16 in Plaintiff's previous lawsuit (No. 15-cv-1258-RAJ) remain in effect in this action.
- 17 6) Plaintiff is responsible for complying with this order, Judge Jones's order, and any other
18 obligations imposed by the Court or the Local Rules. Failure to comply may result in
19 sanctions, including dismissal of this action.

20 DATED this 16th day of February 2018.

21
22 

23 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE